

-8-

REMARKS

The specification at page 5, line 10 is being amended to correct an error by replacing the term "signal" with the term "interface 24." No new matter is being introduced by way of this amendment. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 5-10 stand rejected. Claim 4 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 9 are being amended. Claims 8 and 10 are being cancelled. Claims 11 and 12 are being added. No new matter is being introduced by way of these amendments.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said tone disabler circuit" in line 1 of the claim. Claim 6 is being amended to depend from now amended Claim 1 instead of claim 3. Now amended Claim 1 provides antecedent basis for the limitation "said tone disabler circuit" recited in Claim 6. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 6 as now amended is definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pruett et al. (U.S. Statutory Invention Registration No. H1,884) ("Pruett").

As stated above, Claim 4 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (Claim 1), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (Claim 1) and any intervening claims (Claims 2 and 3). Base Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 2-4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of base Claim 1 is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is being cancelled.

Claims 3, 5, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pruett in view of Wintour (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,098).

Claims 3 is being cancelled.

-9-

Claim 5 depends from now amended base Claim 1, therefore the rejection of Claim 5 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 is being amended to recite first and second echo canceller modules, "configured to make concurrently available for selection to each telecommunication channel (i) a telecommunication signal processed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers] to produce a processed telecommunication signal and (ii) a telecommunication signal unprocessed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers]." Support can be found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 5, line 8 through page 6, line 17 in reference to Fig. 2.

In contrast, Pruett provides a system for transferring echo cancellation algorithm variables from one echo cancellation element to another echo cancellation element when a user associated with a telecommunications channel roams from one cell to another cell (col. 11, lines 60-63). The echo cancellation element of the target cell (i.e., receiving the echo cancellation algorithm variables) uses the echo cancellation algorithm variables in a manner that saves start-up or convergence calculations for the target cell (i.e., using the transferred echo cancellation algorithm variables makes modifying the variables of the echo canceller element of the target unnecessary, other than to be offset for the additional number of frames of delay introduced by the transfer and additional transmission channel path length (col. 12, lines 3-8)). Such a system reduces or eliminates "the degraded telecommunications quality and unwanted noise generation that can accompany the transfer of a caller from a first cell to a second cell" (col. 2, lines 7-9).

Thus, Pruett's transferring of echo cancellation algorithm variables from echo canceller to echo canceller to track handoff of a roaming subscriber may reduce start-up or convergence delay when entering a new cell, but Pruett does not teach or suggest a multi-channel echo canceller that makes concurrently available for selection to each telecommunication channel a telecommunication signal processed and unprocessed by a processor, such as an echo canceller. Therefore, Pruett does not teach first and second echo canceller modules, "configured to make concurrently available for selection to each telecommunication channel (i) a telecommunication signal processed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers] to produce a processed telecommunication signal and (ii) a telecommunication signal unprocessed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers]." as recited in now amended independent Claim 9.

-10-

Wintour teaches a system and method for replacing an active echo canceller with a redundant echo canceller "while minimizing loss of echo canceller services and calls associated with functioning echo cancellers" (col. 3, lines 41-42). According to Wintour's system and method, the redundant echo canceller is activated and call data at the input of the active echo canceller is provided to the inputs of both the active and the redundant echo cancellers. After waiting a predetermined amount of time, the output of the active echo canceller is disconnected from the system and the output of the redundant echo canceller is connected to the system (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 43-55).

Accordingly, Wintour teaches a method wherein call data is provided to both the active and redundant echo cancellers for a predetermined amount of time. Wintour, however, does not add to Pruett first and second echo canceller modules, "configured to make concurrently available for selection to each telecommunication channel (i) a telecommunication signal processed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers] to produce a processed telecommunication signal and (ii) a telecommunication signal unprocessed by the first [and second] multi-channel echo [cancellers]," as recited in now amended independent Claim 9.

Combining Pruett and Wintour produces a system that tracks handoff of mobile system users and provides redundancy for such a system. However, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Pruett nor Wintour, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all elements of now amended independent Claim 9, as recited above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 9 should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wintour in view of Pruett.

Independent Claim 7 is being amended to include similar limitations as now amended independent Claim 9 ("the first multi-channel echo canceller further configured to make concurrently available for selection to the plurality of telecommunication channels (i) a plurality of telecommunication signals processed by the first multi-channel echo canceller to produce a plurality of processed telecommunication signals and (ii) a plurality of telecommunication signals unprocessed by the first multi-channel echo canceller."). Therefore, Claim 7 should be allowed for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 7 should be withdrawn.

-11-

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wintour in view of Pruett and further in view of Reese.

Claim 8 is being amended to recite “monitoring a state condition comprises monitoring whether the processed telecommunication signal or the telecommunication signal unprocessed by the first echo canceller is output on each of the channels.” Support can be found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 5, line 8 through page 6, line 17. Now amended Claim 8 depends from now amended independent Claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 8 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prillet in view of Wintour and further in view of Reese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,162) (“Reese”).

Claim 10 is being amended to recite a first controller “configured to monitor the state of echo cancellation as an indicator of whether the processed telecommunication signal or the telecommunication signal unprocessed by the first echo canceller is output on each channel.” Support can be found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 5, line 8 through page 6, line 17. Now amended Claim 10 depends from now amended independent Claim 9. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 10 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

New Claims 11 and 12 are being added to depend from Claim 1 to claim a manner in which the signal processing parameter may be generated according to an embodiment of the present invention. Support can be found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 5, lines 8-17. Acceptance is respectfully requested.

New Claims 13-21 are being added to focus on an aspect of the invention that includes the limitations being added to Claims 7-10. Support can be found in the specification as originally filed at least at page 4, line 11 through page 6, line 17. Applicants respectfully request that new Claims 13-21 be entered. Because independent Claim 13 includes similar limitations as those being added to independent Claims 7 and 9, as described above, Applicants submit that Claim 13 should be allowed for at least the same reasons. New Claims 14-21 depend from new Claim 13; therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14-21 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as described above with respect to independent Claims 7 and 9.

-12-

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-21) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon
Mark B. Solomon
Registration No. 44,348
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 11/04/05